DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 098 PS 012 529

TITLE	National Evaluation of Head Start Educational Services and Basic Educational Skills Initiative. Project Report 1: Design and Sampling and Project Report 2: Panel Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 78
CONTRACT	HEW-105-78-1306
NOTE	86p.; For related documents, se PS 012 530-33 and TM 810 936-42.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Collection; Early Childhood Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Field Studies; National Programs; Personnel Selection; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Sampling
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

Intended as a supplement to the National Testing Service (NTS) project proposal of September 12, 1978, this report describes the status (as of November 15, 1978) of the evaluation design and the field implementation plan used for the national evaluation study of Head Start Educational Services and the Basic Educational Skills demonstration program. The report includes the following: the major evaluation questions underlying the study, the evaluation design, the field implementation plan, recommended guidelines for the selection of the study's review panel, and the criteria used for selecting Head Start Programs for evaluation. Approximately half of the report includes two appendices. Appendix A contains a description of the study's sampling plan, and Appendix B includes a copy of the Program Description Questionnaire, one of the two major data collection instruments to be used in the study. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NATIONAL EVALUATION OF HEAD START EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AND BASIC EDUCATIONAL SKILLS INITIATIVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Project Report 1: Design and Sampling

and

Project Report 2: Panel Recommendations

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED210098

This Report was prepared for:

The Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Contract NO. HEW-105-78-1306
Project Officers: Dennis Deloria, Dan Ferritor

Prepared by:
NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Judy McNeil, Project Director

PS012529

Purpose of This Report

This report, intended as a supplement to the NTS project proposal of September 12, 1978, describes the status of the evaluation design and field implementation plan for the national evaluation of Head Start Educational Services and the Basic Educational Skills demonstration program as of November 15, 1978, and addresses the following topics: major evaluation questions; evaluation design; field implementation plan; recommendations for the Project Review Panel; the sampling plan (Appendix A); and the Program Description Questionnaire (Appendix B).

Major Evaluation Questions

The conceptual framework, presented in the NTS proposal, was designed to provide a methodological context for addressing the following questions:

> What different approaches are being used by Head Start, Basic Educational Skills and non-Head Start preschool situations for delivering educational services to children and their families?
>
> Are those differences attributable to participation in Basic Educational Skills, or are they related to other factors such as the location of the center or significant differences in staffing from one center to another?
>
> What outcomes for children and their parents are related to their participation in Basic Educational Skills programs, in other Head Start programs or in non-Head Start situations?
>
> Is it possible to identify the particular program approaches or program components that seem to yield desirable outcomes consistently for children and their parents?
>
> In other words, in what particular ways does Head Start work, and how can good programs become better programs with the right kind of support at the right time?

More explicit definition of the evaluation questions will take place over the coures of the project. In particular, the Policy Implications Analysis is expected to articulate policy and primary evaluation questions of this study as hypotheses amenable to systematic examination.

Groups and comparisons: Seventeen Basic Educational Skills internal models, two more than the fifteen originally expected, will be studied during Phase I of the evaluation. It is currently understood that twelve of these models will continue into the 1979-80 program year; in addition, fifteen Basic Educational Skills external model sites will be funded for the 1979-80 program year, but only five of those fifteen programs will probably be heavily involved in the evaluation during Phase II. Additional Basic Educational Skills programs may

be funded as of Fall, 1980.

In the fall of 1979, we expect that the Basic Educational Skills sample of children for the pre-test will include a total of six hundred child-family units, or approximately 25% of the children in each site. There will be no comparison group in the Basic Educational Skills sites. In future years of the evaluation, there will be at least 60 children per site in the evaluation sample.

In addition to the BES programs, the evaluation design will contain 30 randomly selected Head Start program locations. The sampling plan for selecting those 30 Head Start sites is detailed in Appendix A of this report. Within each of those randomly selected sites, a pool of 150 or more families will be recruited for participation in the study, and random assignment procedures (also discussed in Appendix A) will be used to assign children either to the Head Start program or to the control group of each site. We assume that the evaluation will enlist 4-year-old children only---that is, children who are a year away from kindergarten entry---and that 60 to 75 children will be included in each of the two groups.

In addition to children assigned to the Head Start group, there will be other children at most sites who, though served by the programs, will not be part of the evaluation sample, among them children who have been evaluated as handicapped, who are bilingual (instrumentation is not available for assessing those children), and/or those children whom programs determine must be served. Therefore, some programs will be serving upwards of 60 children.

Eventually, there will be three cohorts of children in the evaluation sample. The first cohort will enter Head Start in 1979, the second in 1980, and the third cohort in 1981. The cohorts will comprise a longitudinal sample which will be studied until well into elementary school, perhaps until the sixth grade.

The comparisons planned in this evaluation design are:

- Head Start programs compared to control groups
- Basic Educational Skills programs compared to Head Start programs
- Basic Educational Skills programs compared to control groups
- Also, programs with certain characteristics will be compared to programs without those characteristics, within and across the groupings of programs into BES, Head Start and control. For example, programs with parent involvement in the teaching of children may be compared with programs which do not involve parents in teaching activities.
- For those independent variables for which a continuum is more appropriate than a present-absent distinction, analyses will be relational rather than comparative, e.g., the relationship between the amount of time a program or a child spends on shape-recognition and the

child's ability to recognize shapes.

Variables to be collected: The variables to be collected in this study emerge from the eight components of the conceptual framework, discussed at length in Chapter 2 of the NTS proposal: Determinants of Implementation; Process/Implementation; Exposure to Treatment--Child; Exposure to Treatment---Parent; Child Outcomes and Child Covariates; and Parent Outcome and Parent Covariates.

Phase I data collection will focus on describing the on-going educational processes of Basic Educational Skills and regular Head Start programs. The Program Description Questionnaire, contained in Appendix B, is one of the major instruments for that data collection. Phase II data collection will be the first time during the evaluation that data will be collected for individual children and families. At that time, pre-test data on child and parent outcome variables and covariate information for children and parents will be collected.

Field Implementation Plan

Phase I field work includes:

- o Pilot testing of the instruments, to be conducted during February through March, 1979;
- o Recruiting regular Head Start programs into the evaluation;
- o Developing working relationships with the BES and Head Start sites;
- o Collecting data in the BES and regular Head Start sites which will describe the educational services and other program operations in each of the sites.

Pilot Testing of the Instruments

For each of the instruments selected or devised for this evaluation, manuals and training procedures will be developed for their proper administration; that is, personnel will be taught how to administer the instruments as well as to teach others how to use them. Twenty individuals at that point will be hired and/or deployed from available staff, to administer the instruments in the pilot testing, five in each of four site locations. (Although five locations were proposed in the NTS proposal, the logistics of four locations are more managable as well as more cost-efficient, and we propose to test the same number of subjects as planned initially.) The four locations will be selected to represent the range of locations and community characteristics expected among the sample sites of the evaluation.

The pilot testing will proceed as described in the NTS proposal. The individuals trained to serve as data collectors for the pilot testing will later serve as trainers for local personnel who will collect data during the pre-test phase. To coordinate the pilot testing with the BES and Head Start site visits planned for the spring of 1979, we recommend that training for pilot testing and the pilot testing itself take place in February of 1979.

The report of the pilot testing will include a description of the procedures used for data collection and monitoring, the results of the generalizability study analyses, and final recommendations for instruments to be used in the evaluation; as well as estimates of the average administration time for each instrument, and indications of the training requirements and procedures for each instrument.

Recruiting Regular Head Start Programs for the Evaluation

The selection of regular Head Start programs by random sampling is discussed in Appendix A of this report. Once the statistical selection of sites is completed, the field work necessary to make contact with those sites

and recruit them for the evaluation will proceed as follows: First, NTS will prepare information packets about the evaluation for regional and local Head Start personnel. Second, we will contact regional ACYF personnel to explain the evaluation to them and to obtain their approval for contacting the sites which have been selected in their regions. Next, we will contact the Grantees responsible for the respective programs, and the delegate agencies where appropriate, for approval to contact the selected Head Start programs. Once all approvals have been received, NTS will contact the selected Head Start programs to explain the evaluation and arrange for site visits.

Site visits will take place during February, March and April of 1979. The first day or two of each visit will be used to explain the evaluation in detail and to gain local approval to proceed with the evaluation. The remaining days of the site visits will be spent collecting initial program information in the form of Program Description Questionnaire and classroom observation data.

Developing working relationships with the Basic Educational Skills and regular Head Start programs will be an on-going process throughout the evaluation, particularly during Phase I. NTS has already contacted each of the Basic Educational Skills programs through the BES meeting in Denver and by letter following that meeting.

Data Collection for Phase I

During the site visits to the Basic Educational Skills and regular Head Start programs during February, March and April of 1979, NTS will collect information describing the educational services and other program operations in each of the sites. The two major instruments of this data collection are the Program Description Questionnaire and the classroom level observation instrument. The Program Description Questionnaire, in draft form, is contained in Appendix B of this report, and will be discussed with the project officer and other ACYF staff in the near future. The classroom level observation instrument is a modification of the CDA checklist, and is currently in development.

It was indicated to NTS at the ACYF-NTS briefing following contract award that data collection beyond that suggested in the proposal would be necessary during the spring site visits; specifically, these would be classroom level and program level observations of the Basic Educational Skills programs with respect to how those programs compare to the Head Start programs which are part of the educational services evaluation. As always, the pivotal considerations of such tasks is to incorporate them economically within the logistical context of the design. We anticipate now that each site will be visited for one week by two NTS staff members; during this visit

we also expect to hire a local on-site coordinator for each site, who will help local programs to over-recruit families for the Head Start program and assist in the hiring of local data collectors during the summer. (NOTE: The on-site coordinator will not assist families in finding alternative care, since this function was not approved by ACYF.)

It was also indicated to NTS during the briefing that a second visit to the Basic Educational Skills sites might be advisable, but the logistics of that visit are not resolved at this time.

Following data collection, NTS members will prepare a report describing the information collected during the spring site visits. NTS will meet with ACYF staff to discuss this report in detail, which will address differences between Head Start and Basic Educational Skills programs as well as the differences between regular Head Start programs.

Recommendations for Review Panel

Assembling a panel of early childhood education experts is an important task of this project, since their reviews of the work done by the project staff and its consultants will help to assure that NTS uses only the most practical and valid procedures in conducting this evaluation. We recommend acceptance of the following guidelines for selecting panel members, having adopted them for selecting the nominees:

1. A total of eight panel members will be chosen to serve as authorities in the following areas:
   - o early childhood education (1)
   - o evaluation of early childhood education (2)
   - o observation of classroom behaviors (1)
   - o preschool and early elementary school testing (1)
   - o Head Start program operations (1)
   - o Head Start staff/parents (2)
2. Each panel member will be a recognized expert in at least one of those areas and will have substantial knowledge or expertise in at least one other of the areas. Expertise is defined as combinations of the following: advanced degree work, field experience, on-going research, policy-making experience, and publications in the area of interest. The only exception would be the Head Start parent, where NTS would be looking for a "representative" interested parent of a child receiving Head Start services. NTS recommends this parent be selected from the program of the Head Start staff member who will serve on the review panel.
3. As a group, the panel should constitute a representative cultural mix to assure that the products of this evaluation will be reviewed not only for their technical merit but also for the adequacy with which minority concerns are addressed by the design.

NTS has compiled a tentative list of candidates for panel membership by consulting professional organizations, review panel lists from prior national evaluations and experts known to NTS project staff. After compiling an extensive list of nominees and evaluating them selectively, groups of 2 to 6 candidates were proposed for each of the panel areas. All of these individuals are recommended confidently to ACYF for membership on this panel, and in each area we have indicated which of them are ranked most highly. We expect that further discussion with ACYF will narrow the list to 1 or 2 nominees within each panel area; and NTS will then contact the highest ranked individual in each category to determine whether he or she is willing to serve on the panel.

Rules and Responsibilities of Panel Members

NTS recommends that panel members be responsible for reviewing all aspects of this project from the perspective of their respective domains of expertise. The panel would focus on such areas as:

- o content analysis of all instruments
- o measurement properties of all instruments
- o response burden
- o conceptual framework
- o evaluation questions
- o proposed analyses
- o sampling design
- o statistical treatment
- o data collection strategies
- o race/ethnic/sex-role bias

The review panel would meet on two occasions during Phases I and II of the evaluation. The first meeting is tentatively scheduled for December or January. Throughout the project, panel members will be informed of developments monthly, and their comments and recommendations will be solicited. Any strong differences of opinion between NTS and the panel will be mediated by the ACYF project officer. Because NTS plans to utilize consultants extensively in the formative stages of the contract, the commitment for each panel member will be kept to a reasonable level. The primary purpose of the full panel meetings will be to review the work for the project to date and to discuss and review the planned activities.

Nominations for Members of the Review Panel

Early childhood education: We plan to select one individual for this area of expertise for the review panel. The two individuals which NTS recommends most highly are:

- o James Gallagher, Director of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina
- o J. McV. Hunt, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois

Other authorities in this area are: Millie Almy, University of California at Berkeley; Susan Gray, Peabody College; Pat Miller, Appalachian State University; Marshall Haith, Indiana University; and Sheldon White, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University.

Evaluation of early childhood education: Two people are needed on the panel in this area of expertise. NTS has identified five individuals who can be recommended most highly:

- o Joy Frechtling, Department of Educational Accountability, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland (previously at NIE)
- o Nick Anastasiow, Institute of Child Study, Indiana University
- o Lloyd Bond, Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh
- o Edward DeAvila, Linguametrics, Berkeley, California
- O Victor G. Cicirelli, Psychology Department, Purdue University

Other authorities recommended for this area are Edward Gotts, Appalachian Educational Laboratory; Jane David, Stanford Research Institute; and Michael Wallach, Duke University.

Observation of classroom behaviors: The review panel will seat one member representing this area. The individuals we recommend most highly are:

- o Jean Carew, Research for Children, Menlo Park, California
- o Donald Medley, School of Education, University of Virginia

Other nominees are James McElhinney, Ball State University; Robert Spaulding, San Jose State University; and Barak Rosenshine, University of Oregon (on leave from the School of Education, University of Illinois).

Preschool and early elementary school testing: Two members of the panel will represent this area of expertise. The individuals we recommend most highly are:

- o LaMonte Wyche, School of Education, Howard University
- o Frank Snyder, CTB McGraw-Hill, Monterey, California
- o Chuck Thomas, Indiana University (previously at Research Triangle Institute)
- o Leon Rosenberg, Johns Hopkins University Medical School

Head Start program operations: For this area, NTS nominates:

- o Margaret Emswiler, HEW Region VI, Dallas, Texas
- o Joyce Williams, Specially Funded Coordinator, Pinellas County Head Start, Largo, Florida

Other authorities are: Lynn Kagan, Harvard University (previously PDC coordinator, Norwalk, Connecticut); Paul Vincinanza, HEW Region III, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Lou Fabrizio, Research and Evaluation, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Head Start staff/parent: The representative for Head Start staff nominated by NTS is:

- o Julie Wong, Cedar Grove, North Carolina Head Start program, Pittsboro, North Carolina

As proposed earlier, we recommend that the Head Start parent representative to the review panel be chosen from the same program as the Head Start staff member, which is the Cedar Grove Head Start Center, Cedar Grove, North Carolina.

Head Start Educational Services/BES
Evaluation
Discussion Paper
Michael Everett November 17, 1978

Head Start Program Selection

The evaluation design herein mandates the selection of thirty Head Start Programs, randomly sampled across the country (RFP, page 10). In addition, the existing seventeen Basic Educational Skills internal models will be studied. Of interest are the variations in educational services across different community types, program sponsorship, program size, program costs, part day/full day programs, and family background variables, to name only a few (RFP, page 6). The overall comparisons planned in this evaluation design are:

- Head Start programs compared to control groups
- Basic Educational Skills programs compared to Head Start Programs
- Basic Educational Skills programs compared to control groups
- Programs with certain characteristics will be compared to programs without those characteristics, within and across the groupings of programs into BES , Head Start and control. For example, programs with parent involvement in the teaching of children may be compared with programs which do not involve parents in teaching activities.
- For those independent variables for which a continuum is more appropriate than a present-absent distinction, analyses will be relational rather than comparative, e.g., the relationship between the amount of time a program or a child spends on shape-recognition and the child's ability to recognize shapes.

This paper will discuss the various considerations toward the selection of Head Start programs necessary to meet these design specifications. First general sampling considerations and procedures are presented. Second, four sampling options are presented for ACYF consideration. Third, the relative advantages of each are discussed and NTS recommendations are drawn.

This paper thus augments the original sampling plan submitted by NTS to ACYF (Everett and McNeil; November 15, 1978).

General Sampling Considerations

Three general domains of sampling considerations exist regarding this study; design considerations, operational considerations and cost considerations. The simultaneous contemplation or weighting of elements within and across each domain is necessary to design the "best" sampling plan herein.

Design considerations include the more scientific or experimental criteria of the external validity and of the internal validity of the sample. External validity refers to the generalizability or representativeness of the sample. That is, given a sample of thirty Head Start programs out of the approximately eighteen hundred, to what extent are the results obtained on the sample representative of the expected results across the total population? In this case, the sample must represent the appropriate, or proportionate, mix of contextual characteristics and program characteristics in the total population. For example, if approximately four hundred programs are predominantly rural, a representative sample should contain approximately eight such programs out of the sample of thirty. In other words, the heterogeneity of the total population is reflected within the sample. The inferences then possible are from the sample to the total population.

Internal validity on the other hand, refers to the types of inferences possible within the experiment. To maximize internal validity, the sample must be drawn with the comparisons desired as a priori design elements. For example, if the level of urbanization is of inherent interest the sample should contain an equal number of urban and rural programs; using urbanization as a dichotomous variable. In this case, since a balanced comparison is desired, it may be necessary to use disproportionate sampling procedures to create such a balance. The heterogeneity of the population is not necessarily represented in the sample; and the inference obtained relate to the effect of the independent variable.

Although these two types of validity are not disjoint, it should be obvious that there is an inherent trade off between the external validity and internal

validity of an experiment; attempts to increase the representativeness of the sample decrease the power of the comparisons possible and vice versa. Using the example of urbanization, a maximization of the external validity would opt for eight rural programs being selected, while a primary consideration of internal validity would call for the selection of fifteen rural programs.

This trade off is definitely reflected in this evaluation. Confounding is evident since the Head Start programs selected are to (1) be representative of all Head Start programs, (2) allow comparison with BES programs, and (3) allow comparisons along major program elements (e.g., full day-part day). First, the evaluation mandates the selection of thirty Head Start programs. This limitation affects the possible generalizability of any results given. Second, the Basic Educational Skills programs are given, and they reflect certain disproportionate characteristics (e.g., approximately fifty percent are within public school system delegate agencies, while the overall Head Start population reflects approximately ten percent such programs). Third, in many instances, either the program elements of primary interest are process variables or the data are not available which reflect these elements. This latter point leads into a brief presentation of the second domain of sampling considerations.

The second domain includes operational considerations; the availability of necessary data, and the possible effect of sampling on OMB forms clearance. Operational considerations for design purposes do not include software nor procedural considerations. First, the availability of data is not a constraint for most variables of import, although NTS is cognizant of the need to address the issue of data reliability on those pieces of data requisite for sampling.[1] On several variables, however, there is an apparent lack of information prior to

---

[1]Please refer to the Sampling paper of November 15, 1978, for a discussion of the pilot sampling and data verification procedure.

sampling. For example, the number of four-year-olds the program serves who would be going to kindergarten the following year may be a desirable design variable. Although information is available concerning which states have mandatory kindergarten laws, the information does not complete the data set for all possible Head Start programs. Second, it is our understanding that OMB clearance would probably be facilitated if we can clearly state that (1) the Educational Services Evaluation can be generalized to the national population of non-Demonstration Head Start programs; (2) the BES evaluation will not be generalized to the national population of Head Start programs; and (3) the sampling for Educational Services was not influenced by the BES program selection.

The third domain of consideration includes the costs incurred in the study, primarily transportation costs. The effects on costs of various sampling options cannot be calculated prior to drawing a sample, however, probability statements may be made. For example, a purely random procedure will probably draw more Northeastern and Western delegate agencies than would a stratification procedure which includes four geographic regions. If that occurred, costs could increase accordingly. This consideration is not of major import herein, but should be contemplated in a secondary manner.

Before presenting various sampling options, it is useful to discuss the general selection procedures possible in this study.

General Sampling Procedures

Sampling procedures may range from a completely judgmental selection to a completely random selection procedure with variations in between. Generally speaking, judgemental selection will enhance the internal validity, while random selection is directed toward increasing the external validity of the experiment.

Stratification, or the division of the universe into predetermined cells and the subsequent sampling within each cell, is also often a recommended procedure. Stratification is usually done for one or more of the following reasons:

to insure face validity of the sample, to decrease the variances of the sample estimates, to employ different methods and procedures within strata, or because the subpopulations within the strata are of inherent interest as domains of study (Kish, 1965). There are many potential stratifiers for this study; among the most intuitively obvious are:

- the type of delegate agency (public school system, public service agency, private non-profit, college or university, city, county, other)
- geographical region (four to ten regions depending on use of Census or DHEW regional configuration)
- urban/rural location
- ethnicity and ethnic mixture of children serviced
- type of program offered (full day/part day and variations)
- proportion of Federal Head Start revenue to total operating costs
- size of program

It is readily apparent that the potential sampling matrix generated by these variables consists of more than thirty cells, or more cells than the number of desired sample centers. Therefore, it would be necessary to limit the number of stratifiers in this study.

Another possibility, mentioned in the NTS Sampling Plan (November 15, 1978) is to draw multiple random samples simultaneously and select the "best" sample on a post hoc basis. In order to maximize the representativeness of the final sample, the criterion of selection could be the distributional fit on selected variables to the total Head Start program universe (using a χ^2 statistic). In order to maximize the internal validity, the criterion of selection could be the relative balance on selected variables (e.g., an equivalent number of full day/part day programs). There will not be a completely crossed design, but this is one mode of combining judgemental and random selection procedures in an opportunistic sense.

Please note that logical permutations exist with the above procedures; e.g., programs may be selected on a judgemental or random basis following stratification, or multiple sampling with later final selection may or may not occur. Thus, a wide range of sampling options exists in order to (1) represent Head Start programs across the country (2) allow comparisons with BES programs and (3) allow comparisons along relevant program dimensions. Unfortunately, not all three design needs may be met to the highest degree possible by the same sampling plan. Therefore, the initial decision in designing a sampling plan must focus on prioritizing design needs. The below sampling options illustrate the considerations necessary in selecting a sampling plan. The options are meant to serve as a heuristic basis at this point in time, to foster discussion, and hopefully allow a selection to occur.

Sampling Options

A review of the RFP, conversations with ACYF, and our analysis of the design requirements led to the generation of the following four sampling options for this study. Each is briefly presented, the discussed in terms of their relative advantages and disadvantages.

Option One

A completely random selection procedure with no stratifiers.

Option Two

A stratified reandom selection--stratifying on two dimensions: by level of urbanization (Urban: 50,000 population or more; Small Town: 10,000 - 50,000; and Rural: less than 10,000), and by region, with Northeast corresponding to HEW Regions I, II, III, and V; South being HEW Region IV; Southwest being HEW Region VI; and West including HEW Regions VII, VIII, IX and X. This stratification provides a total of twelve cells. This option is the one presented in the NTS sampling plan of November 15, 1978.

Option Three

A stratified random selection--stratifying on two dimensions: by level of urbanization (as above) and by full day/part day. Full day programs may be defined as operating a minimum of six hours at least four days a week. In this case, there would be six cells, with five programs per cell (or a differing number in each cell, proportional to the number in the population represented by the cell).

Option Four

A stratified random selection on three dimensions--by level of urbanization, by part day/full day, and the relative proportion of four-year-olds attending kindergarten the following year. The last variable would necessitate selecting programs in which all or nearly all four-year-olds attend kindergarten, and programs in which this did not occur.

Option One is directed toward the first design need by maximizing the representativeness of the sample. Option Four is directed toward the design need of allowing for comparisons with BES programs. Options Two and Three represent compromises. These four options with their relative effects concerning the general sampling considerations presented initially are summarized in Table 1. Two recent sampling experiences with Head Start populations provide additional data for sample design. In the evaluation of mainstreaming handicapped children in Head Start conducted by Applied Management Sciences, two variables appeared to be associated with significant variation in Head Start services; program size and urban/rural location. Abt Associates, in the National Head Start Transition Study, also stratified their sample by geographic region and urban/rural location, providing representative variance in type of program and ethnicity of children served.

TABLE 1

HEAD START PROGRAM SAMPLE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS AND OPTIONS

	Option 1 Random	Option 2 Stratified: Region, Urban	Option 3 Stratified: Urban, Program Length	Option 4 Stratified: Urban, Program Length, Four-year-olds
Internal Validity				+
- BES Comparisons	-		+	
- Relevant Program Elements	-	+	+	+
External Validity				
- Representativeness	+	+		-
Data Availability	+	+	+	-
OMB	+			-
Costs	?	+		

+ = large positive effect

\+ = lesser positive effect

\- = negative effect

An additional caveat is necessary before making recommendations. The above discussion has concerned itself primarily with design procedures and options but analytic procedures also interplay in this study. That is, the effect of a given program element may be determined not only in a balanced ANOVA type comparison, but also utilizing a regression format. For example, a major variable of concern in most evaluations is treatment time and dispersion. The part day/full day distinction may serve as a design element, or it may serve as a proxy variable to increase the probability of variance in treatment time. Analytically is it far more potent to obtain and utilize individual treatment time estimates. The sampling procedure may therefore be directed toward meeting one overall design need, generalizability of results, while analytic procedures may meet the need of other types of comparisons.

Recommendations

A logical weighting of all of the above considerations and advantages/disadvantages of each sampling option lead NTS to recommend sampling based upon Option 2--stratification on geographic region and level of urbanization. From previous experiences with Head Start sampling, these strata will provide representative variance in the type of program, ethnicity of the children served, and urban/rural populations. Option two will address directly the issue of generalizability, while allowing for the analytic addressing of other issues. The reader is referred to the NTS Sampling Plan paper of November 15, 1978, for a complete detailing of this sampling plan.

APPENDIX A:

SAMPLING PLAN

Prepared for the

NATIONAL EVALUATION OF HEAD START EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
AND BASIC EDUCATIONAL SKILLS INITIATIVE

November 15, 1978

Michael Everett
Judy McNeil

NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707

APPENDIX A: SAMPLING PLAN

The design for the national evaluation of Head Start Educational Services and the Basic Educational Skills demonstration program requires the recruitment of 30 Head Start programs, randomly sampled from Head Start programs across the country. Within each sampled Head Start location, a group of 120 or more children/families are to be randomly assigned to two groups so that 60 or more of the children attend the Head Start program and 60 or more children do not attend Head Start. The sampling procedures which NTS will follow to meet these design requirements and maximize the representativeness of the sample are detailed in this Appendix. The method for center selection is presented first, followed by a discussion of the child selection procedures.

Center Selection

Fundamental to any experiment, such as this evaluation, is a simultaneous consideration of the external and internal validity of the design. To the degree possible, the sampling procedures proposed below will maximize the external validity, or generalizability, of the experiment to the total Head Start population.

The RFP stipulates that 30 delegate agencies form the sample out of approximately 1,500 Head Start delegate agencies nationally. Though NTS is well aware of the difficulties presented when attempting to implement a uniform research design in this number of sites, the sample size necessary for conclusions to be generalizable is certainly not less than the recommended number, and to assure the maximum degree of representativeness of the sample we recommend using a multifaceted or compound approach for center sampling. First, we will exclude or purge from the population of Head Start delegate agencies those which cannot be included in the gross population from which the sample will be derived; the conditions for such exclusions are defined below. Second, the population of delegate agencies will be stratified along two variables, geographic region and level of urbanization. Third, we will conduct a pilot test of the sampling procedures to estimate: (a) the reliability of the data,(b) the adequacy of the exclusions, (c) the amount of time needed to clear the list of sites through the entire approval process, i.e., through national and regional ACYF staff, and (d) the amount of oversampling that will be needed, owing to the limitations revealed by the analyses of (a) and (b). Fourth, we propose a representativeness check, in which a simultaneous drawing of five to ten complete samples (of 30 to 45 sites each, depending upon the amount of oversampling

deemed necessary) will be evaluated against a substantial number of program variables other than the two used for stratification, to further verify the representativeness of the selected program sites. Fifth, we will determine which particular program within a site to contact in those instances where a site is represented by more than one program. Only at that point should we proceed with the recruitment of programs for the evaluation through the appropriate channels of ACYF and the grantee and delegate agencies. Each of the foregoing steps is detailed in the sections which follow.

Center Exclusion Conditions

NTS proposes to obtain current listings of Head Start delegate agencies from ACYF and Abt Associates. It is our understanding these files are approximately 95% complete and contain the following information: program year ending, program type, geographic area, program account, number of children served, funding level, number of centers, number of classes, expansion money, handicapped children, and options (such as demonstration site). We intend to merge and edit these files to form the basis for our sampling frame.

Certain necessary exclusions from the sampling frame are already known. A site will not be considered for inclusion in the sample if any of the following provisions apply:

- If the delegate agency serves too few children. Since we believe that the sample size of sixty Head Start children is already on the low side of an ideal per-site sample, NTS proposes to consider alternative oversampling options which would assure a pretest sample of sixty control and sixty entering Head Start children. Our estimates suggest the need for seventy-five Head Start children and seventy-five control children per site. Excluded therefore will be a number of small town and rural sites; but the alternative of including sites that cannot deliver the required sample size is unacceptable for design reasons. That is, the power of proposed within-state comparisons is barely adequate with sixty control and Head Start children, and any reduction in this sample will severely diminish our ability to identify treatment effects.[1]

[1] If we assume a rather ambitious effect size of .50 (corrected for unreliability), and a significance level of .05, the proposed sample size of 60 yields a power estimate of .80. If, however, we adjust our expectations downward and assume a corrected effect size of .30 and leave significance level and sample size unchanged, then our power drops below .50.

- If there is a special Head Start program in operation or one is planned in the next three years. Among these are the Child and Family Resource Programs; Home Start Training Centers; Project Developmental Continuity Services to Handicapped Children; Resource Access Projects; Bilingual/ Bicultural Preschool Curriculum Development Projects and Child and Family Mental Health Projects.
- If the site is participating in another major evaluation effort. This criterion for exclusion overlaps to some extent with the criterion above, but additional evaluation efforts are underway, such as the Head Start Health Evaluation.
- If it is a delegate agency of the Indian and Migrant Program Division. The IMPD has stated that a major problem of its Head Start program is that of tracking participating children. Further, their program is still in the formative stage and an evaluation of the impact of that program may be premature.
- If the center is about to be unfunded.
- If unusual or problem circumstances are known to prevail at the site. Since there is no uniform data source for this criterion, we will rely on review of proposed sites by ACYF and Regional staff to exclude such sites from the sample.

After purging by the criteria outlined above, centers will be stratified on two dimensions and coupled by community to complete the sampling frame.

Stratification

Stratification is usually done for one or more of the following reasons: to ensure face validity of the sample, to decrease the variances of the sample estimates, to employ different methods and procedures within strata, or because the subpopulations within the strata are of inherent interest as domains of study (Kish, 1965; Stebbins, et al 1978). Stratification will be used in this study primarily to assure the face validity of the sample. That is, the strata will be chosen so that most or all of the major delegate agency types will be represented in the final sample, and to ensure that the major groups of children served by Head Start are represented.

There are many potential stratifiers for this study; among the most intuitively obvious are:

- the type of delegate agency (public school system, public service agency, private non-profit, college or university, city, county, other)

- geographical region (four to ten regions depending on use of Census or DHEW regional configuration)
- urban/rural location
- ethnicity and ethnic mixture of children serviced
- type of program offered (full day/part day and variations)
- proportion of Federal revenue to total operating costs
- size of program

It is readily apparent that the potential sampling matrix generated by these variables consists of more than thirty cells, or more cells than sample centers. Therefore, it is necessary to limit the number of stratifiers. Two recent sampling experiences with Head Start populations provide a basis for our recommendation. In the evaluation of mainstreaming handicapped children in Head Start conducted by Applied Management Sciences, two variables appeared to be associated with significant variation in Head Start services: program size and urban/rural location. Abt Associates, in the National Head Start Transition Study, also stratified their sample by geographic region and urban/rural location, providing represenative variance in type of program and ethnicity of children served.[2]

Therefore, we propose to stratify the universe of delegate agencies on two dimensions: by level of urbanization (Urban: 50,000 population or more; Small Town: 10,000 - 50,000; and Rural: less than 10,000), and by region, with Northeast corresponding to HEW Regions I, II, III, and V; South being HEW Region IV; Southwest being HEW Region VI; and West including HEW Regions VII, VIII, IX, and X. This stratification provides a total of twelve strata, or an average of 2.5 sample sites per stratum; and though it will not provide perfect discrimination across two dimensions--since some delegate agencies with addresses in urban areas fund Head Start centers in rural areas--NTS anticipates that this imperfection will effect no serious compromise of sample integrity, while guaranteeing that all regions of the country will be represented in the final sample of Head Start children, with both urban and rural populations included.

---

[2]The Head Start Health Services evaluation presently being conducted by Abt Associates is likewise stratifying on geographic region and urbanization (Stebbins, et al, 1978).

Dated, but reasonably accurate, information from the 1976 ACYF delegate agency file provides the following population estimates of children for each stratum:

	Northeast	South	Southwest	West	Total
Urban	62,847	36,052	17,697	32,059	148,655
Small Town	17,220	22,691	9,986	7,555	57,445
Rural	13,777	26,663	11,162	11,856	63,458
TOTAL	93,844	85,406	38,845	51,463	269,558

The number of delegate agencies by stratum is as follows:

	Northeast	South	Southwest	West	Total
Urban	367	54	59	153	633
Small Town	133	84	53	90	360
Rural	165	134	111	108	518
TOTAL	665	272	223	351	1511

Once the delegate sampling frame is complete, NTS will couple delegate agencies by community. For example, all delegate agencies in Los Angeles will be grouped together. If a couplet is sampled or if certain couplets are assigned a sampling probability of one, then a second stage of sampling will be required to identify the single delegate agency to be included in the sample. All delegate agencies will be weighted so that probability of selection is proportional to the number of Head Start children enrolled in each agency. This coupling procedure reduces the number of entities in each stratum by the following proportions:

	Northeast	South	Southwest	West
Urban	.397	.112	.323	.380
Small Town	.053	.131	.038	.056
Rural	.007	.045	.073	.019

Predictably, there is much more aggregation in urban areas than in rural areas. After coupling, the number of sites per stratum becomes:

	Northeast	South	Southwest	West
Urban	225	48	40	95
Small Town	126	73	51	85
Rural	164	128	103	106

In addition, the average number of children served by Head Start per site for each stratum is:

	Northeast	South	Southwest	West
Urban	279	751	442	337
Small Town	137	310	196	89
Rural	84	208	108	112

The wide variation in program size illustrated by this table reinforces the need for stratification to guarantee that the final sample reflects the heterogeneity of the population.

Pilot Test of the Sampling Procedures

To estimate the validity and reliability of the data derived from the merged data file and the adequacy of the exclusion criteria, NTS proposes to draw a pilot sample of fifteen sites, each of which will be contacted for verification of information presumed to be accurate (such as the variables used for exclusion, stratification, and determining representativeness). This will result in an estimate of the accuracy of the data on which the integrity of the sampling plan rests and an estimate of the number of sites which will have to be deleted based on not meeting design requirements.

Concurrently, we will submit the pilot list of sites to the project officer and the regional ACYF offices to determine: (1) to what extent the purges were adequate, (2) a preliminary estimate of the number of sites we will have to delete through this process, and (3) an estimate of the time needed for this stage of the process.

The results of this pilot sampling will be reported to ACYF before proceeding with the actual sampling, as described below.

Increasing the Level of Representativeness

Though it is not possible to stratify on all possible variables, owing to the stipulated size of the sample, NTS can verify the representativeness of the sample by checking the sites derived from the initial stratification and sampling against variables other than the demographics of location and population. Therefore, once our analyses of the pilot sampling establish the degree of oversampling we must do, we will draw 5 to 10 samples of 30 to 45 sites each, and distributional checks will be made against them for all the possible stratifying variables mentioned earlier in this document, such as type of program, proportion of Federal revenue to total expenditures, as well as other identified variables such as the existence of state mandatory kindergarten laws. Some of this information will be available currently, and some will have to be obtained from the agencies after sampling. Then, using a χ^2 statistic, the sample will be selected that best fits the distribution of those multiple variables in the population of delegate agencies.

That is, a combination of random and opportunistic sampling procedures is seen as the best way to maximize the generalizability of this study. There will not be a completely crossed design, as there would be if all distributional

variables were used as stratifiers, but the final sample selected will represent the heterogeneity of the population accurately nevertheless.

Within-Site Sampling

Having derived a sample of generally representative sites by stratification, we can anticipate that more than one delegate agency is accessible per site. In those instances, a single delegate agency will be selected as most representative of its service area and which is expected to be able to meet the requirements of the evaluation design. In rural areas, of course, this could mean selecting centers that are 50 miles apart or more, since some delegate agencies cover multi-county areas with only a single center per county. In those cases the agencies must be scrutinized with particular care, since treatment may vary widely from center to center. If that turns out to be true, it will be more desirable to select all the sample children from one or two of the component centers rather than seek to assemble a composite sample from all of them; and in those instances, centers will be sampled with probability proportional to the number of children within the center, with subsequent selection of a random sample of children from the target centers.

Obtaining Approval and Contacting the Sites

First, information packets will be prepared of several separate items, including explanatory letters from ACYF to the several appropriate parties and agencies, to introduce NTS, to explain the purpose and scope of the study, and to waive selection criteria for the Head Start program--that is, to explain that the design specifications of the study shall not or need not supercede Head Start program enrollment policies. (According to the Federal Register, 7 April 1978, Volume 43, No. 63, pp. 14932-14939, Head Start programs must serve families of lowest income when more children have applied for enrollment in a program than can be accepted.) Also included in the packet will be: letters from NTS to the appropriate parties and persons, explaining why they are being contacted and what kinds of cooperation are being solicited; a description of the study; and copies of parent consent forms and assurances of confidentiality. Once the pilot sites have been selected, appropriate information packets will be sent to the Regional Head Start representatives. A letter will identify the site(s) initially selected for that Region and request consent for NTS to make

initial contact. We anticipate that Regional offices may suggest certain sites not be contacted, that for design or procedural reasons they may not be compatible with the study. Consent to contact the sites will be requested in writing from the Regional representative, and the Region will also be asked to alert the sites by mail or telephone that NTS will be contacting them.

When written approval and the letter of referral is received from the Regional representatives, NTS will forward the appropriate information packet to the local Head Start program. NTS will ask the program to consent to further discussion about the evaluation in writing, and once approval is received, the site developer will contact the program by telephone to arrange for a site visit in February or March to discuss the evaluation with the program director, with the grantee and delegate agency where appropriate, and with the staff and the parent group. The person making this site visit must be sensitive to the site organization and know its particular protocols and concerns. Also, random assignment is a delicate issue, and though critical to the evaluation, the site visitor must be able to justify its value to the served community. Prior to that visit, brief fact-sheets will have been prepared for the sites for distribution to parents. At the site we will emphasize the fact that program contact with the evaluation will be minimal--that NTS will contact families and do follow-up independently, for example, and that child testing will not be done on program premises; that the evaluation, in other words, will be as unobtrusive and non-burdensome to program staff and participants as possible.

If a site proves unacceptable for any reason, it will be replaced by the next-best site among the others sampled. That replacement site will come from the identical stratum as the initial selection, matching its distributional characteristics as closely as possible.

Once agreement is received from the delegate agencies to participate in the evaluation, NTS will provide appropriate documentation to ACYF.

Selection of Samples of Children

Though NTS is committed both from a methodological and ethical perspective to random assignment procedures, we realize that assignment procedures will have to be worked out with each program if the objective is to be achieved in each location. The insights of Ross Conner, a consultant to this study, are particularly valuable in this connection. Conner (1977) conducted an analysis of 12 evaluations which employed randomization, noting that in most cases the proposed design was successfully implemented, but failed in others. The following recommendations represent a synthesis of Conner's observations with those of other NTS consultants to this evaluation:

(1) The assignment plan within each program must be fixed with no exceptions granted once the sample specifications are set. Conner (1977) notes that "a fixed assignment plan appears to be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for successful random assignment"

(2) The evaluation team should conduct the random assignment procedures and not leave this task to local personnel. The temptation to violate the assignment, and probably with defensible reason, would be considerable if Head Start center directors were expected to implement the assignment procedures. In the Drunk Drivers experiment (Ross and Blumenthal, 1975), judges were very creative in explaining why particular cases were "exceptional" and required abandonment of the random assignment procedures.

(3) There needs to be a carrot, if not a stick, as an incentive for cooperation, not only in the random assignment process but throughout this longitudinal study.

(4) One person on the NTS staff should control the randomization

procedure from start to finish.

(5) Client consent to disclosure of all study conditions is strongly recommended. The issue is not whether to inform subjects but how to inform subjects.

(6) Carefully monitor the assignment process and document each step in the process.

We propose following these recommendations to assure a valid and viable sample of children.

Assignment Design

As previously noted, it is important and even necessary to oversample. Based upon the attrition rates reported by Abt Associates in the Home Start Evaluation and the National Day Care Study, we recommend that a minimum of 75 children be sampled for both Head Start and control groups. (If the program can serve only 60 at a time, the additional 15 can be used to fill spaces in the program that become vacant up to the time that pretest data collection is completed.) The sample selection will be performed by NTS from a complete list for that site of Head Start eligible children, which may be fortified with extra children recruited by the centers (with assistance from NTS). In order to increase the power of Head Start/control comparisons, we propose to develop two exchangable samples of children who are matched, to the extent possible, on sex and ethnicity. Other possible factors, such as prior Head Start experience, either by the child or the family, will not be used as criteria for matching, since these factors are apt to be seen as special priorities for selection of children into Head Start whose use would provoke insurmountable resistance from the delegate agencies and centers selected for the study. After matching, children will be randomly assigned to either Head Start of control conditions.

On Site Coordinator

A vital aspect of selecting an adequate sample pool of children is the hiring of a local on-site evaluation coordinator. At the current time, there are large numbers of children living in poverty who are not enrolled in Head Start. ACYF documents (January 18, 1978 expansion fund allottments) indicate that this is true for most areas where Head Start is available as well as the areas not currently served by Head Start. However, most delegate agencies do not maintain lengthy waiting lists or conduct active recruiting campaigns, since sufficient numbers of eligible children are easily obtainable. Delegate agencies do not generally wish to bear the expenses of actively recruiting children nor maintaining waiting lists when the allotted slots for their program have already been filled. Therefore, the hiring of an on-site coordinator constitutes an incentive for delegate agencies to participate in the research, and will also assure the evaluation that active recruitment takes place. The duties of the on-site coordinator are outlined as follows, with number three seen as primary:

(1) Maintain contact with the local Head Start Program for all phases of the evaluation, helping when necessary to answer questions of the Head Start staff and community.
(2) Maintain contact with the NTS staff to sustain good relations between NTS and the site.
(3) During June, July and August, assist programs that need to recruit families for the evaluation design. (The on-site coordinator can provide ideas and help, but will do no actual parent contact.)
(4) During July, screen applicants for on-site data collectors (NTS staff will make the final hiring decisions).
(5) In September, participate in training as one of the on-site data collectors and as the coordinator of the local data collection

effort.

The importance of the on-site coordinator cannot be overstated. This individual will maintain contact with the control group and help to sustain their goodwill; help to maintain good contact between Head Start staff and Head Start families; and assist in sample maintenance and tracking during the course of the evaluation.

Assignment Procedures

After a list is prepared of all eligible children, certain children must be excluded; but within each site there will be a number of "must-serves," children who will be served by the program but will not be in the evaluation sample. Among these children are:

- All children identified as handicapped. Most programs want to serve all the handicapped children who are interested in Head Start participation, and we would be unlikely to find appropriate control children or sufficient numbers of un-served handicapped children to form an adequate control sample. This is especially true in rural areas where Head Start is primary provider of services to the handicapped.
- Children in crisis situations: including victims of abuse, neglect, and various types of family emergencies. Such children may be identified by court or social service agency referral.

In addition, special-status children would include all those who do not speak English.

Each site will submit a list of all children eligible for Head Start Included on this list (to be designed, printed and supplied to the centers by NTS) will be a place for noting special status. NTS will purge the eligibles list of all special status children, and then separate the

list into two groups (male and female) for each ethnic group (as illustrated below).

Ethnicity					
Black		White		Hispanic	
Males	Females	Male	Females	Males	Females

Pairs of children will be formed by linking every two children on each list. The youngest children will be assigned, alternately, to Head Start and to control groups, and child pairs will be randomly selected from each list in proportion to the total number of pairs available. For instance: 90 pairs of children remain in two lists of 30 pairs and 60 pairs (males and females of a single ethnic group). From the first list, 20 pairs will be selected (1/3 of the total), and 40 pairs (2/3 of the total) will be selected from the second list. Children whose parents refuse to participate in the research, or who become unavailable prior to the pretest, will not be replaced. We expect that approximately 10 percent of the Head Start and control group children will be lost prior to the pretest, owing to parent refusals, failure to locate families,

family moves, and a variety of other factors.

Sample Documentation

Upon completion of the sampling procedures, NTS will provide a complete description of the sampling procedures, including an analysis of the effect of purging children, as well as full documentation on the sampled children for both Head Start and control conditions. This document will be designed in conformation to established policies of confidentiality and regulatory constraints.

APPENDIX B:

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Prepared for the

NATIONAL EVALUATION OF HEAD START EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
AND BASIC EDUCATIONAL SKILLS INITIATIVE

November 15, 1978

Jacelyn Wedell-Monnig
Rebecca Posante-Loro

NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707

The Program Description Questionnaire is divided into parts according to topics and respondant(s). An overview of the questionnaire is presented on the following pages. All parts utilizing written reports (census, PIU, or PESP) as the primary source will be completed to the extent possible before the site visit by NTS staff. The parts requiring responses from program personnel will be mailed to the site before the visit. Respondants will be instructed to answer as many questions as possible; NTS site visitors will help clarify any questions and complete answers during the visit.

In addition, a few questions will be asked only in person by NTS staff during site visits. These questions are found at the end of each relevant part.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE OVERVIEW

PART	TOPIC	PRIMARY SOURCE	VERIFIED BY
I	Community Characteristics	Census Reports	---
II	External Agency Support and Resource Commitment	PIR[1] Report	Regional Office
III A	Program Population Characteristics	PESP[2] PIR	Program Director
III B	Center Physical Characteristics	PESP	Program Director
III C	Center Operations	PESP PIR	Program Director Program Records
III D	Evaluation	PESP	Program Director
III E	Staff Training	PESP	Program Director
IV	Staff Characteristics	PESP	Program Records
V A	Budget	Program Director	---
V B	Program Organizational Characteristics	Program Director	---
V C	Staffing Patterns	Program Director	---
V D	Continuity of Effort	Porgram Director	---
VI	Center Organizational Characteristics	Center Director	---
VII	Parent Involvement	Parent Involvement Coordinator	---
VIII	Curriculum	Program Written Curriculum Educational Services Coordinator	

[1] PIR = Program Information Report

[2] PESP = Program Education Services Plan

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Source: Advance Phone Conversations with Program Director and Delegate Agency

PROGRAM NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

PROGRAM DIRECTOR _____

DELEGATE AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

CONTACT _____

GRANTEE AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

CONTACT _____

CHECK CENTERS LIKELY TO BE IN EVALUATION	NAMES AND LOCATIONS OF ALL CENTERS	NUMBER OF YEARS OLD
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Source: Census Reports

PART I: COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

1. RACE (%)
   - _____ White
   - _____ Black
   - _____ Hispanic
   - _____ Asian
   - _____ Native American
   - _____ Other

2. AGES OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS (%), Median
   - _____ Under 18
   - _____ 18 - 24
   - _____ 25 - 29
   - _____ 30 - 59
   - _____ Over 60

3. INCOME (%), $\bar{X}$, Median
   - _____ 0 - 4,999
   - _____ 5,000 - 9,999
   - _____ 10,000 - 14,999
   - _____ 15,000 - 19,999
   - _____ + 20,000

4. EDUCATION LEVEL (%)
   - _____ Less than High School
   - _____ Some High School
   - _____ High School Degree
   - _____ Some College
   - _____ College Degree

5. OCCUPATIONS (%)
   - _____ Professional/Technical
   - _____ Managerial/Administrators
   - _____ Craftsmen/Foremen
   - _____ Sales/Clerical
   - _____ Skilled Laborers
   - _____ Unskilled Laborers
   - _____ Unemployed

6. MARITAL STATUS OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS (%)

_____ Married

_____ Divorced/Separated

_____ Widowed

_____ Never Married

7. SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD (%), $\bar{X}$, Median

_____ 1 child

_____ 2 - 3

_____ 4 - 5

_____ + 5

PART II: EXTERNAL AGENCY SUPPORT AND RESOURCE COMMITMENT

Once sites have been identified, regional staff will be asked by phone and by letter to supply NTS with the information detailed on the following page.

Sources: Staff and Project Information Report
Verified By: Regional Office

PART II: EXTERNAL AGENCY SUPPORT AND RESOURCE COMMITMENT

Program_____

Address_____

_____

1. What is the amount of the ACYF grant awarded to this program for the present program year? $_____

   Does this program receive any financial or in-kind support other than that received from ACYF?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #2
   ☐ No. Go to #3

2. Please list the sources of additional funding, the approximate amount received yearly and the purpose of the support. (e.g., for the handicapped children).

SOURCE	DOLLAR AMOUNT OR VALUE OF SERVICES RECEIVED	STATED PURPOSE

3. Please attach Form HEW-608T for the above program.

PART III: PROGRAM POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Part III will be completed in advance by the NTS sraff after reviewing the appropriate program documents. These parts will then be verified with the program director during the site visit.

Source: Program Education Services Plan and Program Information Report

Verified By: Program Director

PART III A: PROGRAM POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS *Information about the population served by the entire program. (Approximate numbers are sufficient.)*

1. How many of the families served by your program are:

_____ White
_____ Black
_____ Hispanic
_____ Asian
_____ Native American
_____ Other

2. How many of the parents or guardians in your program fall into the following age ranges? *(Each family counted once.)*

_____ Under 18 years old
_____ 18 - 24 years old
_____ 25 - 29 years old
_____ 30 - 59 years old
_____ Over 60 years old

3. How many of your families have annual income in the following categories? *(Consider cash income only.)*

_____ $0 - 4,999
_____ $5,000 - 9,999
_____ $10,000 - 14,999
_____ $15,000 - 19,999
_____ over $20,000

4. How many of your parents or guardians have reached the following levels of education? *(Each family counted once.)*

_____ Less than High School education (through grade 8)
_____ Some High School (grades 9 to 11)
_____ High School Degree
_____ Some College or Post-High School training (1 to 3 years)
_____ College Degree

5. How many of your parents or guardians (principle wage earner) have jobs in the following categories?

_____ Professional/Technical

_____ Managerial/Administrators

_____ Craftsmen/Foremen

_____ Sales/Clerical

_____ Skilled Laborers

_____ Unskilled Laborers

_____ Unemployed

6. How many of your parents or guardians are:

_____ Married

_____ Divorced/Separated

_____ Widowed

_____ Never Married

7. How many of your families have:

_____ 1 child

_____ 2 - 3 children

_____ 4 - 5 children

_____ more than 5 children

8. How would you describe your service area? *(Please check one category.)*

_____ Rural or Small Towns

_____ Urban

_____ Rural/Urban

_____ Suburban

Source: Program Education Services Plan

Verified By: Program Director

PART IIIB: CENTER PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Approximately how old are each of the buildings in which the centers are located? *(Please make one check for each center.)*

CENTER NO.	AGE OF BUILDING		
	1-10 years old	10-20 years old	20 or more years old
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

2. How would you describe the condition of the buildings in which your centers are housed? *(Please make one check for each center.)*

	BUILDING CONDITION			
CENTER NO.	INADEQUATE TO DANGEROUS	ADEQUATE, IN NEED OF REPAIR	ADEQUATE, NO REPAIR NEEDED	GOOD TO EXCELLENT
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

3. What types of buildings are your centers in? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ Former public school building
_____ Public school building; also used for elementary classes
_____ Church
_____ Community center
_____ Rented commercial building
_____ Other *(Please describe.)*

4. What is the approximate square footage of work and play space, indoor and outdoor?

CENTER	OUTDOOR	INDOOR
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

(in square feet)

5. How convenient is public transportation (buses or subways) to the center?

_____ very convenient
_____ available, but not convenient
_____ not available

6. Does Head Start or another agency provide transportation for the children?

☐ Yes. Who provides transportation?

☐ No. Go to #7.

7. On the average, how far do the children live from the centers in your program?

_____ 0 - 2 miles
_____ 2 - 5 miles
_____ 5 - 10 miles
_____ 10 or more miles

Sources: Program Education Services Plan and Program Information Report

Verified By: Program Director and Program Records

PART IIIC: CENTER OPERATIONS

1. How long has each center been in operation as a Head Start center?

CENTER	YEARS IN OPERATION
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

2. How many months per year and days per week does each center operate? *(Please check all that apply.)*

CENTER	MONTHS IN OPERATION		DAYS IN OPERATION				
	All Year	School Year	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

3. In each center how many hours a day is in in operation? *(Please make one check for each center.)*

	HOURS OF OPERATION				
CENTER	Full Day	Half Day	3/4 Day	Split Sessons (2 half days)	Other (please describe)
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

4. How many children are <u>served</u> in each center, how many are you <u>funded to serve</u>, and what is the <u>average daily attendance</u>?

CENTER	NUMBER CHILDREN SERVED	NUMBER CHILDREN FUNDED	AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

5. In each center, how many classrooms are in operation? What age children does each contain?

CENTER	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS SERVING			
	3 year olds	4 year olds	5 year olds	Mixed Ages
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

6. How do parents find out about your program? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ Door-to-door recruitment campaign

_____ Posters in housing projects, gorcery stores, community centers, etc.

_____ Radio, television or newspaper ads

_____ Word-of-mouth

_____ Older children were in Head Start

_____ Other *(Please describe.)*

7. Of the families in your service area who are eligible for Head Start, how many sign up for your program?

_____ Almost all of those eligible

_____ At least half of those eligible

_____ Less than half of those eligible

_____ I don't know

8. Of those families who do sign up for your program, how many are you able to serve?

_____ Almost all of those signed up

_____ At least half of those signed up

_____ Less than half of those signed up

_____ Proportion Unknown

9. If you are unable to serve all the families who do sign up for Head Start, How do you decide whom to serve? *(Please list the criteria in order of priority.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Who is involved in decisions? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ project director

_____ center directors

_____ teachers

_____ other staff

_____ parent advisory committee

_____ other *(please specify)*

10. Is there a waiting list for admission?

☐ Yes. Go to #11.

☐ No. Go to #12.

11. If yes, what is the approximate size of the list:

at the beginning of the year? _____ *(number of children)*

at the end of the year? _____ *(number of children)*

12. Approximately how many children leave the program before the end of the program year?

_____ number of children

13. What is the most common reason for leaving? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ parents lacked interest

_____ transportaion problems

_____ moved from area

_____ found other arrangements

_____ we don't know

_____ other *(please describe)*

14. Is there information on what happens to those children who leave the program?

☐ Yes. Go to #15.

☐ No. Go to Part IIID.

15. What does happen to them?

Source: Program Education Services Plan
Verified By: Program Director

PART IIID: EVALUATION

1. Does your program evaluate its own effectiveness?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #2.

   ☐ No. Go to #4.

2. If yes, how often? _____

3. What is done with the information from this evaluation?

4. How are program and training needs identified? How often does this identification procedure occur?

5. Does your program carry out staff evaluations?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #6.

   ☐ No. Go to #7.

6. Who carries out these evaluations? Please describe the general procedures and content.

7. What kinds of child evaluations are conducted? *(Please describe types of evaluations and name specific tests you use.)*

8. How often are these child evaluations done? By whom?

9. What is done with the information from these assessments?

10. Once you have identified children with hearing impairments, psychomotor delays, language problems, what procedure do you follow for referrals, educational plans, etc., for them?

Source: Program Education Services Plan
Verified By: Program Director

PART IIIE: STAFF TRAINING

1. Is any type of training available to your teachers and/or other staff?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #2.

   ☐ No. Stop here.

2. Who sponsors the training?

   _____ our program

   _____ outside organizations or agencies

3. Regardless of who sponsors the training, who actually conducts it? *(Check all that apply.)*

   _____ Classroom teachers

   _____ Program administrators

   _____ Specialized program staff

   _____ Public school staff

   _____ Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Agency

   _____ Non-program professionals

   _____ Other *(please specify)*_____

4. On the average, how often is a classroom teacher exposed to any training once he/she is employed by your program?

   _____ weekly

   _____ monthly

   _____ irregularly

5. Who participates in training sessions? *(Check all that apply.)*

   _____ classroom teachers

   _____ paid classroom aides

   _____ volunteer classroom aides

   _____ program administrators

   _____ program specialized staff

6. Are paid staff released from duties to attend training sessions?

   ☐ Yes.

   ☐ No.

7. What topics have program-sponsored workshops conducted in the program in the past six months dealt with? *(Please list topics.)*

8. Are staff compensated financially for completing training sessions? Are any other incentives offered?

9. Do staff receive any kind of educational credit for attending sessions?

☐ Yes. Please describe.

☐ No.

10. In your opinion, how useful have the various forms of training been? Please rank in order of usefulness in day-to-day activities, greatest to least.

_____ program-organizes and run workshops

_____ workshops led by outside professionals, specifically for program staff

_____ courses and/or workshops held at local colleges or universities

_____ workshops run by Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Agency

_____ other *(Please specify.)*

(BES sites only)

11. Are there new training sessions planned or in progress specifically concerning the BES guidelines?

PART IV: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Part IV will be completed in advance by reviewing the PESP and verified on-site by checking program personnel records.

Source: Program Education Services Plan
Verified By: Program Records

PART IV: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

For each program we will be collecting information on the composition of the present staff including titles/responsibilities

age

sex

race

hours of work

experience with Head Start or early childhood

educational background

This information will be taken from the Program Education Services Plan and verified on-site by checking program records.

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Center	Titles/Responsibilities	Full	Part	Vol.	Consultant	Age	Race	Sex	Prior HS or Early Childhood Experience	Education Level Attained	Subject
1.a.											
b.											
c.											
d.											
e.											
f.											
g.											
h.											
i.											

(FOR OUR COLLECTION PROCEDURES)

PARTS V - VIII

TO: Program Director

FROM: NTS staff member

RE: Program Description Questionnaire

The attached pages are those parts of the PDQ which we discussed in our earlier phone conversations. You will note that each part is identified as to what we feel is the appropriate respondant. If you feel that these parts would be more appropriately filled out by other people on your staff, please just note the title change at the top of the page. This copy of the PDQ is primarily for your own use; we will bring another copy with us on our visit on _____(date)_____, and will help you complete the questionnaire at that time.

Source: Program Director

PART VA: BUDGET

Your budget report submitted to ACYF (Form 608T) (attached) is broken down into categories. We would like more information on the 'other' category.

How much money is yearly allocated to:

_____ meals

_____ staff training

_____ facilities - upkeep, rent, utilities

_____ classroom materials

_____ handicapped services

_____ health services

_____ parent activity funds

_____ other *(Please describe.)*

Source: Program Director

PART VB: PROGRAM ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Has your program ever served as a demonstration or replication site for any project?

☐ Yes. Go to #2.

(BES SITES) ☐ BES only. Go to #4.

(HEAD START SITES) ☐ No. Go to #4

2. What was the project and how long was your program involved?

3. What were the start-up difficulties which you wxperienced with this project? The long term difficulties? Please describe.

4. Does your program now have any unique features that were designed and implemented by local staff and/or parents?

☐ Yes. Go to #5.

☐ No. Go to #7.

5. Please briefly describe your innovations and/or attach any written documentation you might have.

6. When you propose or implement new ideas, what support or feedback do you receive from the following organizations? *(Please make one check in each row.)*

	VERY ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT	POSITIVE SUPPORT	NEUTRAL SUPPORT	NEGATIVE SUPPORT	VERY NEGATIVE SUPPORT	N/A (No Such Agency)
Delegate Agency	____	____	____	____	____	____
Grantee Agency	____	____	____	____	____	____
State-level HS	____	____	____	____	____	____
ACYF Regional Staff	____	____	____	____	____	____
ACYF National Staff	____	____	____	____	____	____

7. Have any of the following organizations ever suggested a program change to you? *(Please make one check in each row.)*

Delegate Agency	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A (no such agency)
Grantee Agency	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
State-level Head Start	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
ACYF Regional Staff	☐ Yes	☐ No	
ACYF National Staff	☐ Yes	☐ No	

8. If you answered "yes" to any of the above, please briefly describe the program change suggested. If it was implemented, how was that done? How successful was the change?

9. How frequently do you have contact with the following organizations for any purpose? *(Please make one check in each row.)*

	NA (no such agency)	No Communication	Rare Communication (less than once a month)	Occasional Communication (1 - 3 times per month)	Regular Communication (weekly)	Constant Communication (almost daily)
DELEGATE AGENCY						
GRANTEE AGENCY						
STATE LEVEL HEAD START						
ACYF REGIONAL STAFF						
ACYF NATIONAL STAFF						
HEAD START TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCIES						
LOCAL SOURCES OF FUNDING AND/OR ASSISTANCE						
OTHER HEAD START PROGRAMS:						
WITHIN 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM						
BEYOND 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM						

10. In most cases, who initiates communication between your program and the other organization?

	PROGRAM YOU ARE A PART OF	OTHER ORGANIZATION
DELEGATE AGENCY	_____	_____
GRANTEE AGENCY	_____	_____
STATE LEVEL HEAD START	_____	_____
ACYF REGIONAL STAFF	_____	_____
ACYF NATIONAL STAFF	_____	_____
HEAD START TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCIES	_____	_____
LOCAL SOURCES OF FUNDING AND/OR ASSISTANCE	_____	_____
OTHER HEAD START PROGRAMS:		
WITHIN 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____
BEYOND 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____

11. How does the communication take place? Please note the approximate percentages in each category. *For example, 75% of your contacts with your grantee may be made by phone and 25% by letter.*

	PHONE	SCHEDULED 2-3 PERSON MEETING	FORMAL GROUP MEETING	INFORMAL UNSCHEDULED DISCUSSION	MEMO OR LETTER
DELEGATE AGENCY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GRANTEE AGENCY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
STATE LEVEL HEAD START	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ACYF REGIONAL STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ACYF NATIONAL STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
HEAD START TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCIES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
LOCAL SOURCES OF FUNDING AND/OR ASSISTANCE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER HEAD START PROGRAMS: WITHIN 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
BEYOND 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. How would you characterize the quality of your communication with these organizations?

	DIFFICULT MANY DIFFERENCES OF OPINION	UNEASY: WE DISAGREE ON SOME ISSUES	NEUTRAL	GOOD: OCCASIONAL DIFFERENCES	EXCELLENT: VERY FEW DIFFERENCES
DELEGATE AGENCY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GRANTEE AGENCY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
STATE LEVEL HEAD START	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ACYF REGIONAL STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ACYF NATIONAL STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
HEAD START TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCIES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
LOCAL SOURCES OF FUNDING AND/OR ASSISTANCE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER HEAD START PROGRAMS: WITHIN 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
BEYOND 25 MILES OF YOUR PROGRAM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Source: Program Director

PART VC: STAFFING PATTERNS

1. For each position and/or title in your centers please briefly describe the duties, responsibilities and requirements for that role. If you prefer, you may just attach job descriptions prepared for advertising each position.

2. Do your full-time teachers teach morning and afternoon classes?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #4.

   ☐ No. Go to #3.

3. If not, what are their responsibilities when not in the classroom?

4. What is your average turnover rate for each position (staff leaving the program)?

   For example: Center Director - once every 2 years
   Teachers - once a year

5. On the average, how often do individuals change positions within your program (staff assuming other duties in the program)?

   _____ about every 6 months or more often

   _____ every 6 months to once a year

   _____ every one to two years or less often

Source: Program Director

PART VD: CONTINUITY OF EFFORT

1. How have you interpreted "continuity" in your program? *(Please be as specific as possible.)*

2. Does your school district provide public kindergarten?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #4.

   ☐ No. Go to #3.

3. What provisions are made for five-year-olds in your area?

4. What schools will your children enter after completing your program? *(Please provide the names, locations and approximate number of children from your program entering each in the fall.)*

School	Location	Number of Head Start Children Entering
_____	_____	_____

(BES ONLY)

5. Did you have to make special arrangements for entry into these schools or do your children always enter just these schools?

6. Communication between preschool programs and public schools takes place in many ways. How would you describe the communication that you have? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ almost no communication

at the administrative and/or specialized staff level:

_____ funding

_____ staff training

_____ parent involvement

_____ curriculum

_____ individual children

_____ other (please specify)_____

at the teacher level:

_____ teachers have some training sessions together

_____ meet to discuss curriculum

_____ meet to discuss parent involvement

_____ to discuss individual children

_____ there is an exchange of teachers between Head Start and public school

_____ former program teachers now teach in public school

_____ other (please specify)_____

at the child level:

_____ children visit public school regularly

_____ children visit public school before enrolling in kindergarten

_____ other (please specify)_____

at the parent level:

_____ program parents encouraged to participate in public school activities

_____ other (please specify)_____

7. Which of these modes of communication have proven most successful in your program? What in your opinion has made them successful?

8. How would you describe the relationship you have with your local public schools?

_____ difficult - public schools resistent to Head Start program suggestions

_____ one-way - public schools accept program suggestions, but make few of their own

_____ good - public schools are cooperative and eager to participate in this new venture

_____ excellent - public schools and Head Start have long-term working relationship

_____ other (please specify)_____

9. What is your most difficult problem, as you see it, in terms of the program-public school relationships?

PART VI: CENTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

TO: Center Directors

FROM: NTS staff members

RE: Program Description Questionnaire

As your Program Director, _____(name)_____, has already discussed with you, your program and center have been selected to be in a nation-wide evaluation of Head Start Educational Services. To aid us in the evaluation, we would appreciate it if you would look over the attached pages concerning communications within your program. You may fill out the questionnaire now if you wish or wait until our visit on _____(date)_____ and we will help you complete it. Your answers will be held in complete confidentiality. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Source: Center Director

PART VI: CENTER ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. How frequently do you have contact with the following people in your program? Please make one check in each row.

	NO COMMUNICATION	RARE COMMUNICATION (LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH)	OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION (1 - 3 TIMES A MONTH)	REGULAR COMMUNICATION (WEEKLY)	CONSTANT COMMUNICATION (ALMOST DAILY)
PROGRAM DIRECTOR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER CENTER DIRECTORS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
NON-TEACHING STAFF SPECIALISTS (*education coordinator, social services coordinator, language specialist, etc.*)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. In most cases, who initiates communications?

	You	Other Person
PROGRAM DIRECTOR	_____	_____
OTHER CENTER DIRECTORS	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF	_____	_____
NON-TEACHING STAFF SPECIALISTS *(education coordinator, social coordinator, language specialist, etc.)*	_____	_____
PARENTS	_____	_____

3. By what means does communication take place in your program and center between the following groups of individuals? Please note the approximate percentages in each category. *For example, 75% of your contacts with your program director may be by phone, 15% in formal staff meetings, and 10% by memo.*

	PHONE	SCHEDULED 2-3 PERSON MEETING	FORMAL GROUP MEETING	INFORMAL UNSCHEDULED DISCUSSION	MEMO OR LETTER
PROGRAM AND CENTER DIRECTORS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND TEACHING STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND NON-TEACHING STAFF SPECIALISTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF (AMONG THEMSELVES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF AND PARENTS					

4. How would you characterize relationships within your program and center between the following groups of people? *(Check one category in each row.)*

	DIFFICULT: MANY DIFFERENCES	UNEASY: WE AGREE ON SOME ISSUES	NEUTRAL	GOOD: OCCASIONAL DIFFERENCES	EXCELLENT: VERY FEW DIFFERENCES
PROGRAM AND CENTER DIRECTOR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND TEACHING STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONAL STAFF	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CENTER DIRECTOR AND PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF (AMONG THEMSELVES)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TEACHING STAFF AND PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PART VII: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

TO: Program Parent Involvement Coordinator

FROM: NTS Staff member

RE: Program Description Questionnaire

As your Program DIrector, _____(name)_____, has already discussed with you, your program has been selected to be in a nation-wide evaluation of Head Start Educational Services. To aid us in the evaluation, we would appreciate it if you would look over the attached pages concerning parent involvement within your program. You may fill out the questionnaire now if you wish or wait until our visit on _____(date)_____ and we will help you complete it. Your answers will be held in complete confidentiality. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Source: Parent Involvement Coordinator

PART VII: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

1. Under ideal circumstances, what would you like parent involvement to be like in your program?

2. In reality, how have you interpreted parent involvement in your program? (Please be as specific as possible.)

3. What percent of your parents are actively involved in your program

   on a daily basis?_____

   on a weekly basis?_____

   on a monthly basis?_____

4. Of the parents that are involved, what percent are

   mothers?_____

   fathers?_____

   other (grandparents, gardians, etc.)?_____

5. Of the parents that are involved, what percent are involved in

   regular classroom activities? _____

   special classroom activities (such as field trips or parties)? _____

   fund raising activities? _____

   policy making groups? _____

   parent training classes or workshops? _____

   adult education classes (G.E.D., sewing, driving, etc.)? _____

   recreational activities for parents? _____

   teaching activities at home? _____

   other (please specify)? _____

   CAN TOTAL MORE THAN 100%

6. Do you have a formal parent policy group?

   ☐ Yes. Go to #7.

   ☐ No. Go to #13.

7. How often does the parent policy group meet per month?_____

8. On the average, how many parents attend the meetings?_____

9. How do parents become part of the policy making group?

_____elected by parents

_____volunteer

_____asked by program staff

_____other (please specify)

10. What types of issues does the parent policy group deal with?

11. Was the parent policy group involved in the proposal you wrote for BES funding? In what way?

12. What roles do your program staff have in parent policy group meetings?

_____ conduct the meetings

_____ serve as advisors

_____ observe

_____ other (please describe)

13. Do you conduct workshops, classes, etc., for parents?

☐ Yes. Go to #14

☐ No. Go to #19

14. How often do these workshops or classes occur?

_____ regularly each week

_____ regularly each month

_____ irregularly but scheduled

_____ other (please specify)_____

15. Which of the following topics are covered in these workshops or classes? (Check all that apply.)

_____ emotional development

_____ cognitive/intellectual development

_____ language development

_____ physical development

_____ nutrition

_____ handicapping conditions

_____ health and health care

_____ classroom activities

_____ other (please specify)_____

16. Who teaches the workshops or classes? (Check all that apply.)

_____ program administrators

_____ classroom teachers

_____ program specialists (parent involvement coordinator, staff social worker, etc.)

_____ head start training and technical assistance providers

_____ school district staff

_____ non-program professionals (college teachers, psychologists, etc.)

_____ other (please specify)

17. What is the relative emphasis on theoretical or practical content in these workshops or classes?

ALMOST ALL THEORETICAL	MOSTLY THEORETICAL	EQUALLY MIXED	MOSTLY PRACTICAL	ALMOST ALL PRACTICAL
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

18. How do you enlist parent participation in the sessions? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ parents request sessions

_____ post announcements

_____ call parents individually

_____ send announcements home

_____ other (please specify)_____

19. Would you say that parents or staff initiate most of the parent activities in your program? Does it depend on the activity?

(BES SITES ONLY)

20. Have you had an opportunity to discuss the specific BES goals with parents? How and when did you do this?

(BES SITES ONLY)

21. What were the parents' responses to the goals?

22. What are the means of program-parent communication? *(Check all that apply.)*

_____ regular newsletter
_____ informal individual notes sent home
_____ phone calls
_____ home visits
_____ with parents individually at center
_____ meet with parents in organized groups at center
_____ meet with parents in informal groups at center
_____ other *(Please specify)*_____

23. Have you developed methods to encourage parents to work at home with their children in teaching basic skills?

☐ Yes. Go to #24. Please describe.

☐ No. Go to #25.

24. Do you feel that your methods have worked with parents?

☐ Yes. Why?

☐ No. Why not?

(BES SITES ONLY)

25. Have you found it necessary to change your parent involvement program in any way to conform to the BES guidelines? How?

26. Do you have a "lending library" that parents can visit to get ideas or borrow materials to use at home?

☐ Yes. Go to #27

☐ No. Stop here.

27. What proportion of your parents make use of the library at least

weekly?_____

monthly?_____

irregularly?_____

never?_____

28. What kinds of materials are available in your lending library? (check all that apply)

_____ books on parenting skills

_____ children's books

_____ puzzles, games, etc.

_____ cookbooks

_____ manipulative materials

_____ filmstrips, projectors

_____ records, record players

_____ educational kits

_____ other (please specify)_____

Additional questions to be asked in person during site visit:

1. What are the roles of parents in the classroom? What amount of time do parents serve in these roles?

2. Concerning parent workshops, who actually teaches the sessions? What topics do different people teach? How often does each person teach?

PART VIII: CURRICULUM

TO: PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COORDINATOR

FROM: NTS Staff Member

RE: Program Description Questionnaire

As your Program Director, _____(name)_____, has already discussed with you, your program has been selected to be in a nation-wide evaluation of Head Start Educational Services. To aid us in the evaluation we would appreciate it if you would look over the attached page concerning curriculum in your program. You may fill out the questionnaire now if you wish or wait until our visit on _____(date)_____ and we will help you complete it. Your answers will be held in complete confidentiality. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Source: Program Written Curriculum and Educational Services Coordinator

PART VIII: CURRICULUM

1. Do you have a written curriculum at this point in time?

   ☐ Yes. Please submit a copy of it with this questionnaire, then go to #2.

   ☐ No. Go to #2.

2. Briefly, how would you describe the approach to curriculum planning taken by your program? Is everything written out, do you have loose plans, subject to change every day, or do teachers rely on their own intuition and experience and organize things as they happen?

(BES ONLY)

3. Have you found it necessary to adjust your approach to curriculum to conform to the BES guidelines? In what way?

4. Do you feel that the language-cultural differences you deal with are unusual?

   ☐ Yes. Please describe these differences and how you deal with them.

   ☐ No. Go to #5.

5. Please rank the following as to their priority in the curriculum of your program.

   _____ academic skills (reading, writing, arithmetic)

   _____ cognitive development

   _____ health

   _____ language development

   _____ motor skills

   _____ socio-emotional development

   _____ other (please specify)

Additional questions to be asked in person during site visit:

1. How have you dealt with the issue of individualized instruction?

2. The fostering of positive learning attitudes in children can sometimes be difficult. How has your program approaced this issue?

3. Issues involving cultural and language differences are sensitive ones. How has your program dealt with these issues?